

REMARKS

Claims 2-4, 7, 11-13, 16-18, 20-28, 36-41, 43, 44, 46, 51-56, 59-61, and 64-66 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-10, 14, 15, 19, 29-35, 42, 45, 47-50, 57, and 58 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants expressly reserve the right to file one or more divisional applications reciting subject matter presented by one or more of the now-cancelled claims. New claim 66 has been added. As this new claim is supported in the specification at page 4, lines 7-8, Applicants respectfully present no new matter has been added.

I. **35 USC § 112**

Claims 1, 64 and 65 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim that which is considered the invention. The Office Action notes various phrases which render claims 1 and 64 unclear. Claim 64 has been amended (claim 1 having been cancelled) to clarify these allegedly confusing phrases.

II. **35 USC § 102**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,996,154). However, as claim 1 has been cancelled, Applicants respectfully present that this rejection is now moot.

III. **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the presence of allowable subject matter in claims 64 and 65. Accordingly, each pending claim has been rewritten to depend from one of claims 64 and 65.

Although claims 2-4, 7, 11-13, 16-18, 20-28, 36-41, 43, 44, 46, 51-56, and 59-61 were previously withdrawn from consideration as not being directed to elected subject matter, each of these claims has been amended to depend from claim 64 (either directly or indirectly). Because each pending claim depends from elected claim 64, each of the previously withdrawn claims now

recites elected subject matter. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request each of these claims be allowed.

Thus, Applicants respectfully present that each pending claim (1) reads on the elected subject matter and (2) recites allowable subject matter.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all objections and rejections are overcome. Thus, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas P. Pavelko
Registration No. 31,689

TPP/EPR/mat
Attorney Docket No.: TPP 30890A

STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 785-0100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200 or (202) 408-5088

Date: March 4, 2004